

# California Department of Education

## Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools



Prepared by:

English Learner and Accountability Division  
District and School Improvement Division  
Curriculum, Learning, and Accountability Branch

Data Management Division  
Finance, Technology, and Administration Branch

Special Education Division  
Special Services and Support Branch

August 2011

Description: This report is for students served in the 2009-10 school year with Title I, Part D funds in At-Risk, Neglected, and Juvenile Detention Programs statewide, and provides an update on the status of state monitoring reviews for county court schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice schools.

Authority: Supplemental Report of the 2008 Budget Act, Item 6110-001-0001

Recipient: Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office

Due Date: Identification of Schools, September 2010; State Monitoring Update, April 2011

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

**Table of Contents**

Executive Summary .....	1
Part I: Identification and Reporting .....	2
Part II: Status of State Monitoring.....	4
Section 1: Federal Program Monitoring.....	4
Section 2: Special Education Monitoring.....	35
Attachment 1: 2009–10 County Court, County Community, and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools with Teacher Information	
Attachment 2: 2009–10 LEA Reporting Form for ESEA Title I, Part D, Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk-Demographics	

# California Department of Education

## Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

### Executive Summary

The Supplemental Report of the 2008 Budget Act, Item 6110-001-0001 requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to prepare and report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and appropriate fiscal committees of the Legislature a two-part report related to county court schools and State Division Juvenile Justice (DJJ) schools. Part I addresses the students served in the 2009–10 school year with Title I, Part D funds in At-Risk, Neglected, and Juvenile Detention Programs. This information is collected in the Consolidated Application for reporting on the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Part II provides an update on CDE monitoring of county court schools and DJJ schools, especially as it relates to Federal Program Monitoring (FPM), previously known as Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM), English Learners (ELs), and Special Education services. This part of the report is divided into two sections. The first section includes information on monitoring of programs within the FPM process such as the state program for ELs (and relevant Title III requirements). The second section provides information on Special Education monitoring, which is separate from the FPM process.

In summary:

**Part I:** During 2009–10, 89,413 students were served in county court and community schools, a decrease from 94,565 (5,152) students.

**Part II, Section 1:** This is a follow-up on last year's report and includes information on the six elements required by the supplemental report. Three fiscal years of data are included in this report: 2008–09, 2009–10, and 2010–11. In 2010–11, six monitoring reviews will be conducted; two remain in progress or are scheduled to be completed by September 2011.

**Part II, Section 2:** This is a follow-up on last year's report and includes information on the six elements required by the supplemental report. For the 2009–10 data collection period, seven county court schools participated in a verification review.

This report is available on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/>. If you have any questions regarding this report or need a copy of this report, please contact the FPM Office by phone at 916-319-0935 or by e-mail at [fpmoffice@cde.ca.gov](mailto:fpmoffice@cde.ca.gov).

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

**Part I: Identification and Reporting of County Court Schools and State Division of  
Juvenile Justice Schools**

The following is an update for the 2009–10 school year related to the identification and reporting of county court schools, county community schools, and State Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) schools.

**Element 1**

**A complete list of county court schools, county community schools, and Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) schools statewide by County-District-School (CDS) code.**

The complete list of county court schools, county community schools, and DJJ schools statewide by CDS code is provided in Attachment 1, 2009–10 County Court, County Community, and Division of Juvenile Justice Schools with Teacher Information. Note: Multiple classroom sites or facilities in the county court and county community schools may be under the umbrella of one CDS code.

**Element 2**

**Basic student enrollment and assessment and accountability data for each school and summarized for county court schools and DJJ schools statewide. The annual report will disaggregate student level data by student subgroups at both the school and statewide level.**

During the 2009–10 school year, 89,413 students were **served** in county court and county community schools. These numbers represent an unduplicated count of students, which means a student is counted only once even though a student may have been admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

The number of students **served** by Title I, Part D funds in At-Risk, Neglected, and Juvenile Detention Programs statewide collected in the Consolidated Application (ConApp) for reporting on the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is provided in Attachment 2, 2009–10 LEA Reporting Form for ESEA Title I, Part D, Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk-Demographics. The CDE reports data annually on the CSPR to include demographics, academic, and vocational outcomes, as well as performance data for those students that have completed pre- and post-tests in reading and mathematics. Two new data elements were collected during 2009–10: the total

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

number of programs operating in a multi-purpose facility and the number of long-term students served.

As shown on Attachment 1, a total of 30,137 students were enrolled in 2009–10 in county court and county community sites on California Basic Education Data System Information Day, October 6, 2010. On any given day within the reporting year, approximately 30,000 students may be in county court and county community schools, and an additional 1,000 students may be in DJJ schools.

#### Element 3

**Basic teacher data for each school and summarized for county court schools and DJJ schools statewide including the number of vacant teacher positions, the number of teachers with full credentials and without full credentials, the number of teacher misassignments, and the percent of classes in core academic subjects taught by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliant and non-NCLB compliant teachers at the school.**

During the 2009–10 school year, the following teacher information was not collected (See Attachment 1) by the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System for county court, county community, or DJJ schools:

- Number of teachers with full credentials
- Number of teachers without full credentials
- Number of core classes taught
- Number of classes taught by Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) compliant teachers
- Number of classes taught by non-ESEA compliant teachers

The CDE does not collect the following for county court, county community, or DJJ schools:

- Number of teacher misassignments
- Number of vacant teacher positions

## California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

### **Part II: State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Juvenile Justice Schools**

#### **Section 1: Federal Program Monitoring**

This section provides information on programs which participate in the Federal Program Monitoring (FPM) process (English Learner and Neglected or Delinquent) related to the six elements.

##### **Element 1**

**A description of CDE's monitoring process for county court schools and state DJJ schools statewide for purposes of assuring compliance with state and federal programs and for monitoring access to services and performance outcomes for youth attending these schools.**

##### **General Overview**

The CDE monitors a number of categorical programs through the FPM process, excluding Special Education, at County court schools and DJJ schools. In 2010–11, the CDE completed the redesign of the compliance monitoring system and fully implemented the use of a risk-based approach to determine the selection of local educational agencies (LEAs) for review.

The FPM Office coordinates these reviews through a combination of data and document review and on-site visits. LEAs are assigned to one of four cycles: A, B, C, or D. Each year, CDE analyzes extensive data for all LEAs that receive categorical funds in two of the four cycles. LEAs may be selected for an on-site or online monitoring review every two years.

##### **Selection Process**

The selection process considers academic performance, as well as fiscal spending and program reporting requirements, including American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 funds. The selection process examined the following:

- Academic Performance Index (API)
- Status under Titles I, II, and III accountability systems
- Combined amount of carry-over of categorical funds

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

- Combined per pupil allocation of categorical funds for school districts
- Combined allocation of categorical funds for county offices of education (COEs)

Using this established selection criteria, approximately 60 LEAs are selected for on-site or online monitoring. Several LEAs are also randomly selected each year for monitoring.

The complete list of LEAs selected for a review in 2010–11 is available on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/>.

### **Participating Programs**

In 2010–11, Fiscal Monitoring, Education Jobs Fund, and Education Equity joined the FPM process. The scope of programs reviewed within each LEA is dependent primarily upon the categorical funds received and the categorical programs operated by the LEA. The following is the list of participating programs for 2010–11:

1. Before and After School Programs
2. Career Technical Education
3. Child Development
4. Compensatory Education
5. Education Equity
6. Education Jobs Fund
7. English Learner
8. Fiscal Monitoring
9. HIV/AIDS Prevention
10. Homeless Education
11. Improving Teacher Quality
12. Migrant Education
13. Neglected or Delinquent
14. Physical Education
15. State Fiscal Stabilization Funds
16. Uniform Complaint Procedures

The Compensatory Education and Neglected or Delinquent programs participate in most COE reviews. Several of the COE visits also include the English Learner (EL) program. It is important to note that while there is a specific EL program that is part of the FPM process, services to all students, including ELs, are reviewed within the context of each program being reviewed. The specific program requirements for each program are contained within their respective FPM Program Instruments, which are available on the CDE Compliance Monitoring Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/>.

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

#### **California Accountability and Improvement System**

The CDE, with assistance from the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, fully implemented the use of the online compliance monitoring and communication tool known as the California Accountability and Improvement System (CAIS) in 2010–11. CAIS has the capacity to store and track large volumes of compliance evidence and other information, improve communication and coordination between the CDE and LEAs, and in general, bring greater efficiency to compliance monitoring.

The CDE, California Comprehensive Center, WestEd, and COE staff provide CAIS technical support through an orientation Webinar and in-person trainings to LEAs selected for a FPM review.

Prior to a review, CDE staff review data and documents in CAIS pertaining to the specific categorical programs operated by county court schools and DJJ schools. Several weeks prior to the review, CDE staff provides feedback using CAIS to the LEA regarding the preliminary review of the data and documents submitted. During the review, the CDE program monitors evaluate evidence to determine whether the LEA is meeting statutory requirements as stated in the appropriate FPM program instrument. Evidence may include data documents, and for on-site visits, interviews and observations.

#### **Element 2**

**A listing of specific CDE monitoring reviews and site visits conducted—including, but not limited to, Categorical Program Monitoring, English learners, and special education reviews—for county court schools and State DJJ schools in the current and prior fiscal year and a summary of the findings and outcomes of each of those reviews.**

Due to the suspension of reviews in February 2009 by the CDE, select reviews scheduled for 2008–09 were delayed until 2010. The following is an overview of these reviews by LEA name, date, and summary of non-compliant findings and current status identified in the Compensatory Education (CE), English Learner (EL), and Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) programs.

Note: The following summary of findings reflect the original language from the Notification of Finding document issued to the LEA.



California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

**2010–11 Federal Program Monitoring Reviews**

In 2010–11, six COEs were selected for FPM reviews that included visits to county court schools. Approximately four of the six reviews of county court schools have been completed. The remaining reviews will be completed by September 2011.

**Solano County Office of Education (Cycle A On-site Review)**

January 19 to 21, 2011

Sites visited: COE level, Solano County Community, Solano County Juvenile Hall

The Solano COE review resulted in 15 non-compliant findings as listed below.

1.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-CE 02: CE School Parent Involvement Policy
	Finding:	Through interviews with administrative staff, the Solano County Office of Education (SCOPE) did not provide evidence of a school-level parental involvement policy that contained items in CE 2.0 through CE 2.5.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
2.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 04: CE LEA Plan, monitoring
	Finding:	During interviews with administrative staff, and lack of current documentation provided, it has been determined that the SCOPE has not completed the LEA Plan to help low-achieving children meet challenging achievement academic standards and describe high-quality student academic assessments.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
3.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 05: CE LEA in PI: Revise LEA Plan
	Finding:	During interviews with administrative staff, it was determined that the SCOPE is currently updating the LEA Plan due to their recent identification in PI status.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
4.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 06: CE LEA technical assistance to PI schools
	Finding:	During interviews with administrative staff, it was determined that SCOPE staff are providing technical

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

		assistance during the development and implementation of the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) for the Community School and Juvenile Detention Facility.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
5.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 07: CE School Site Council (SSC)
	Finding:	Evidence provided in the SPSA for the Community School and Juvenile Detention Facility showed the composition of the SSC not meeting requirements.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
6.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 08: CE SSC Approves SPSA
	Finding:	During interviews with administrative staff, review of budgetary documents, and review of the SPSA provided, it was determined that the current SPSAs for the Community School and the Juvenile Detention Facility did not meet legal requirements.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
7.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	III-CE 21: CE LEA equipment inventory
	Finding:	During interviews with administrative staff, it was determined that SCOE currently does not have an updated copy of the inventory of items purchased with Title I, Part A funds at this time; nor has a physical check been completed within the last two years.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
8.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-CE 28: CE LEA evaluates effectiveness of programs
	Finding:	During interviews with administrative staff and the lack of documentation, the LEA has not conducted an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities funded by Title I, Part A funds using academic assessments.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
9.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-CE 29: CE LEA/SSC annually evaluate SPSA services
	Finding:	During interviews with administrative staff, it was determined that the SSC has not conducted an annual evaluation of the strategies described in the SPSA and the evaluation has not been used to

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

		improve or modify the existing Title I, Part A program.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
10.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	VII-CE 37: CE All students meet State proficiency levels
	Finding:	During interviews with administrative staff and due to lack of documentation, this item does not currently meet requirements.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
11.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-EL 01: Parent Outreach and Involvement
	Finding:	A review of LEA policies and procedures, samples of communications provided to parents of English learners and interviews with administrators demonstrated that the LEA has not implemented a process to facilitate outreach to parents of English learners to elicit the parents' recommendations and inform them how they can be involved in the education of their children.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
12.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-EL 05: Identification, Assessment, and Notification
	Finding:	A review of SCOE policies/procedures and interviews with LEA and site staff at the Solano County Community School and Juvenile Hall School indicate that timely notification of parents of all English learners attending SCOE programs cannot be verified because California English Language Development Test (CELDT) testing is currently handled by SCOE, while the responsibility for notification is understood to be the responsibility of the student's former district.
	Current Status:	Resolved
13.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-EL 13: EL Program Evaluation
	Finding:	A review of the SPSA, evaluation reports and interviews with site and LEA administrators indicates that the LEA has not implemented a process and criteria to determine the effectiveness of programs for English learners, including an on-going mechanism for using the procedures described above to improve program implementation and to modify the program, as needed.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
14.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	VII-EL 20: ELD
	Finding:	A review of district placement policies for English learners, student records, as well as classroom observation and interviews with students, teachers, and administrators reveals that not all English learners at the Solano County Community School and Juvenile Hall School are receiving a focused program of instruction to address their individual needs in English language development, in order to help them develop proficiency in English as rapidly as possible.
	Current Status:	Resolved
15.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-N or D 13: N or D Accountability
	Finding:	The LEA must, at least once every three years, evaluate the N or D Program, must use multiple and appropriate measures of student progress in evaluating the N or D Programs, and must use the evaluation results to improve the programs. Interviews with the SCOE staff indicate that such an evaluation has not occurred, but is in progress.
	Current Status:	Resolved

**Tulare County Office of Education (Cycle A On-site Review)**

March 28 to 30, 2011

Sites visited: COE level, Tulare County Community, Tulare County Court

The Tulare COE review resulted in 14 non-compliant findings as listed below.

1.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-CE 01: CE LEA Parent Involvement Policy
	Finding:	Interviews and review of documents did not indicate that the Parent Involvement policy was developed with, agreed to, and distributed to parents.
	Current Status:	Under Compliance Agreement
2.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 04: CE LEA Plan, monitoring
	Finding:	A review of the LEA plan for Tulare County Office of

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

		Education (TCOE) and interviews with administrative staff indicated that the existing LEA Plan for the TCOE dated 2008 had not been updated and lists the court and community schools as programs. Currently there is no LEA Plan for TCOE to function as an LEA to the following schools: Tulare County Court School, Tulare County Community School, University Preparatory High School, and La Sierra Military Academy, Eleanor Roosevelt Community Learning Center, and Valley Life Charter.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
3.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	III-CE 18: CE LEA disburses funds consistent with ConApp
	Finding:	Review of documents and interviews did not indicate that the funds in the approved ConApp for parental involvement, homeless children, neglected children, delinquent children, and professional development are disbursed for the stated and approved purpose of the reservation.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
4.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-CE 27: CE LEA posts School Accountability Report Card (SARC)
	Finding:	During a review of the SARC online and interviews with administrative staff only, as parents were not available, it was determined that parents or guardians have not been notified that a copy of the annual SARC would be provided upon request.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
5.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-CE 28: CE LEA evaluates effectiveness of programs
	Finding:	Review of documents submitted indicates that there is no LEA plan that includes the requirements of 28 through 28.3.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
6.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-EL 2. A school site with 21 or more ELs has a functioning EL Advisory Committee (ELAC)
	Finding:	A review of the student enrollment data and interviews with administrative and school staff at the Tulare County Court School revealed that 47 English learners are currently enrolled at the school. The LEA does not maintain a functioning ELAC.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

	Current Status:	Resolved
7.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-EL 3. A LEA with 51 or more EL has a functioning District English Language Advisory Committee (DELAC) or a subcommittee of an existing district committee in which at least 51 percent of the members are parents (not employed by the district) of ELs.
	Finding:	A review of the LEA's enrollment and interviews with administrative staff revealed that the LEA does not have a functioning DELAC although enrollment records indicate there are more than 51 English learners in the district.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
8.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-EL 6. A LEA operating categorical programs, including Title III and EIA-LEP, must implement and monitor the approved LEA Plan with components (a) through (f).
	Finding:	A review of the LEA Plan for Tulare County Office of Education (TCOE) and interviews with administrative staff indicated that the existing LEA Plan for the TCOE dated 2008 had not been updated and lists the court and community schools as programs. Currently there is no LEA Plan for TCOE to function as an LEA to the following schools: Tulare County Court School, Tulare County Community School, University Preparatory High School, and La Sierra Military Academy, Eleanor Roosevelt Community Learning Center, and Valley Life Charter.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
9.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-EL 7. For all programs funded through the ConApp including programs for English learners, EIA-LEP and Title III and operated at the school, the School Site Council (SSC) must annually develop, review, update, and approve the SPSA, including proposed expenditures. The SPSA consolidates all plans required by these programs and includes requirements (a) through (e).
	Finding:	A review of the 2007/2009–10 SPSA document and minutes from the School Site Advisory Group (SSAG), and the 2010–11 ConApp, along with interviews with administrative staff and SSAG members at the Tulare County Court School, reveal that the SPSA dated 2007

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

		did not include the use of EIA-LEP funds and was not approved by the governing board.
	Current Status:	Resolved
10.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	III-EL 11. The LEA must disburse categorical funds, including EIA-LEP, in accordance with the approved ConApp and in accordance with EI 11.1.
	Finding:	A review of the Tulare County Court School SPSA dated 2007, the ConApp, and expenditure records indicate that the use of EIA-LEP are not included in the SPSA.
	Current Status:	Resolved
11.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-EL 13. The district must implement a process and criteria to determine the effectiveness of programs for English learners, including items (i) and (ii).
	Finding:	Interviews with administrative staff confirmed that an EL Master Plan was being developed and that currently there is no process for determining the effectiveness of the program for English learners.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
12.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-N or D 06: N or D Governance SSC Members
	Finding:	During a review of the minutes from the SSAG, interviews with administrative and school staff, and observations, it was determined that the SSAG is not currently properly composed of school personnel, students and community members.
	Current Status:	Resolved
13.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	III-N or D 09: N or D Funding Supplement, not Supplant
	Finding:	During interviews with educational staff, administrative staff, and review of the 2010-11 SPSA, it was determined the \$15,000 budget for intense intervention for California High School Exit Examination preparation is not an allowable expenditure with Title I, Part D funds.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
14.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-N or D 13: N or D Accountability
	Finding:	During the review of documents and interviews with administrative staff, it was determined that the TCOE Court and Community Schools do not currently

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

		evaluate the Title I, Part D program and disaggregate the data by gender, race, ethnicity, and age nor does the TCOE use the evaluation results to improve the Title I, Part D program.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements

**San Diego County Office of Education (Cycle A On-site Review)**

May 24 to 27, 2011

Sites visited: COE level, Hope Region Community, Metro Region Community

The San Diego COE review resulted in 10 non-compliant findings program as listed below.

1.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-CE 01: CE LEA Parent Involvement Policy
	Finding:	Review of documents and discussions with administrators indicated that the parent involvement policy has not yet been approved by the local governing board.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
2.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-CE 02: CE School Parent Involvement Policy
	Finding:	Review of documents and interviews with administrators did not indicate that Metro Community School, Monarch School, and Hope Regional Community School with the approval from the local board, have jointly developed with and distributed to parents of Title I students a written parental involvement policy.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
3.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 06: CE LEA technical assistance to PI schools
	Finding:	Review of documents and interviews with administrators did not indicate that the District provided technical assistance to Metro Community School, Monarch Elementary School, and Hope Regional Community School to develop and implement SPSAs for these schools.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements



California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

4.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 07: CE School Site Council (SSC)
	Finding:	Review of documents and interviews with administrators did not indicate that Metro Community School, Monarch School, and Hope Regional School have formed SSCs. The District must provide documentation that Metro Community School, Monarch School, Hope Regional Community School have formed SSCs that meet membership requirements for each school.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
5.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 08: CE SSC Approves SPSA
	Finding:	Review of documents and discussion with administrators indicated that Metro Regional Community School, Monarch Elementary, and Hope Regional Community School SSCs do not develop SPSAs that meet the above requirements.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
6.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-CE 27: CE LEA posts SARC
	Finding:	Review of documents and discussion with administrators did not indicate that a hard copy of the SARC will be provided upon request.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
7.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-CE 28: CE LEA evaluates effectiveness of programs
	Finding:	Review of documents and discussion with administrators indicates that the District has not reviewed the actions and activities in the SPSA.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
8.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-CE 29: CE LEA/SSC annually evaluate SPSA services
	Finding:	Review of documents and discussions with administrators indicate that the SSCs of Metro Community School, Monarch Elementary School, and Hope Regional Community School have not annually evaluated and determined if the needs of all children have been met by the strategies described in the SPSAs to ensure students meet state academic standards.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
9.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	V-CE 32: CE School resources for professional development
	Finding:	Review of documents and discussions with administrators did not indicate that Metro Regional Community School, Monarch Elementary School, or Hope Regional Community School devote not less than 10 percent of their Title I, Part A funds for professional development to address the academic achievement problem that caused the school to be identified for school improvement.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
10.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	VII-CE 37: CE All students meet State proficiency levels
	Finding:	Review of documents and discussions with administrators indicated that the Metro Regional Community School and Monarch School do not implement activities, instructional strategies, and accelerated curriculum described in the SPSA that enable all children identified by the school as failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet the state's proficient and advanced levels of academic achievement.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements

**Merced County Office of Education (Cycle C Online)**

June 27 to 30, 2011

Sites visited: COE level, Merced County Juvenile Hall/Community and Valley Community

The Merced COE review resulted in four non-compliant findings as listed below.

1.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-CE 01: CE LEA Parent Involvement Policy
	Finding:	Review of documents did not indicate that the governing board has adopted and is implement a policy on parent involvement that is developed jointly with, agreed to, and distributed to parents.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
2.	Dimension-Program	II-CE 07: CE School Site Council (SSC)

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

	Number and Focus:	
	Finding:	Review of documents indicate that the SSC members for Merced County Juvenile Hall/Community School and the SSC members for Valley Community School do not meet these requirements.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
3.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	V-CE 30: CE Parent notification: Letter if teacher not Highly Qualified Teacher
	Finding:	Review of documents indicates that the district hires teachers that are not ESEA-compliant to teach in core academic classes.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements
4.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-N or D 06: N or D Governance SSC Members
	Finding:	Review of documents indicate that the SSC members for Merced County Juvenile Hall/Community School and the SSC members for Valley Community School do not meet these requirements.
	Current Status:	Does Not Meet Requirements

**Note: The following reviews are in process or have not yet occurred.**

**Orange County Office of Education (Cycle C Online)**

July 25 to 26, 2011

Scheduled Site Visits: COE level, Access Juvenile Hall

**Los Angeles County Office of Education (Cycle C Online Review)**

August 29 to September 2, 2011

Scheduled Site visits: COE level, Central Juvenile Hall, Gonzales (David) Camp, Kilpatrick (Vernon) Camp, Mendenhall (William) Camp, Munz (John) Camp

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

**2009–10 Federal Program Monitoring Reviews**

In 2009–10, two COEs and two DJJ sites were reviewed during this period.

**San Bernardino County Office of Education (Cycle D On-site)**

May 4 to 7, 2010

Sites visited: COE level, East Valley Community Day, San Bernardino County Juvenile Detention and Assessment Center

The San Bernardino COE review resulted in 10 non-compliant findings as listed below. All non-compliant items have been resolved.

1.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-EL 1. EL Involvement Outreach to parents
	Finding:	A review of LEA documentation and interviews with county staff reveal that the letter informing parents of ELs of such failure (to make progress on the annual measurable objectives) was sent to parents on December 22, missing the 30 days deadline.
	Current Status:	Resolved
2.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-EL 3. EL involvement in District English Language Advisory Committee (DELAC)
	Finding:	A review of San Bernardino County Office of Education (SBCOE) documentation and interviews with county staff reveal that although some efforts are being done to form a DELAC and to hold meetings with parents, there is no evidence of a functioning DELAC.
	Current Status:	Resolved
3.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-EL 05. EL Governance Student Reporting
	Finding:	A review of student records at SBC Juvenile Detention and Assessment Center reveal that not all IEPs nor SBCOE addendums specify whether the CELDT was given with accommodations, modifications, or an alternate assessment for the CELDT.
	Current Status:	Resolved
4.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 15. CE Governance II-PI 9
	Finding:	A review of the Single Plan for Student Achievement

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

		(SPSA) for Juvenile Court School and East Valley Community Day school and interviews with staff reveals the SPSA Plan does not include the selection of a corrective action for inclusion in the SPSA.
	Current Status:	Resolved
5.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 17. EC SPSA II-Cross Program (CP) 5
	Finding:	A review of the SPSA for Juvenile Court School and East Valley Community Day and interviews with staff reveals the SPSA Plan does not include (a) The means of annually evaluating the progress of programs toward accomplishing the goals, including determining whether the needs of all children have been met by the strategies used, particularly the needs of low-achieving students and those at risk of not meeting state academic content standards, (b) uses a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school to develop the SPSA and (c) strategies to increase parental involvement, including providing individual student academic assessment results in a language the parents understand and an interpretation of those results.
	Current Status:	Resolved
6.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 20. CE Inventory Records II-CP 8
	Finding:	A review of the SBCOE Inventory Verification Record indicated the following items were missing: d) funding source and h) current condition.
	Current Status:	Resolved
7.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 33. CE SPSA IV-CP 14
	Finding:	A review of the SPSA for Juvenile Court School and East Valley Community Day and interviews with staff reveals the SSC had not conducted an annually review of the SPSA to determine if the strategies used are meeting the needs of the students to ensure students are meeting the state academic content standards.
	Current Status:	Resolved
8.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-N or D 09. N or D Governance II-CP 8
	Finding:	A review of the inventory provided, and interviews with SBCOE reveal that the (d) Funding Source and (h)

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

		Current Condition is not included in the inventory record for equipment purchased with Title I, Part D funds.
	Current Status:	Resolved
9.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	III-N or D 12. N or D Funding Uses Title I Part D Funds
	Finding:	A review of documentation, observations, and interviews with staff indicate the Network Specialist Position Description does not correctly reflect duties and activities funded allowable with Title I, Part D funds. At the current time, the Network Specialist supports the educational program with activities that must be included in the Position Description.
	Current Status:	Resolved
10.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-N or D 14. N or D Accountability
	Finding:	Interviews with administrative and certificated staff reveal that an evaluation of the Title I, Part D program has not occurred in the past three years in accordance with the above stated criteria.
	Current Status:	Resolved

**Santa Clara County Office of Education (Cycle D On-site)**

May 26 to 28, 2010

Sites visited: COE level, Santa Clara Juvenile Hall, County Community

The Santa Clara COE review resulted in seven non-compliant findings as listed below. All non-compliant items have been resolved.

1.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-EL 2. EL Involvement EL Advisory Committee (ELAC)
	Finding:	A review of the ELAC minutes, agendas, and meeting notifications, as well as interviews with county and site staff revealed that the ELAC at Santa Clara Juvenile Hall was not constituted legally, did not receive training nor fulfilled its responsibilities to advise the SSC on the development of the SPSA, advised the principal and school site staff on the school's needs assessment, language census, and did not meet the requirements g-h.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

	Current Status:	Resolved
2.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-EL 3. EL Involvement Functioning District English Language Advisory Committee (DELAC)
	Finding:	A review of DELAC agendas, power point presentations, sign-in lists and through interviews to administrators and staff demonstrated that at SCCOE there is not a functioning DELAC as required by law.
	Current Status:	Resolved
3.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-EL 14. Accountability Determines the Effectiveness
	Finding:	A review of the LEA Plan, Master Plan for English Learners, SPSA, data reports, and interviews with administrators, teachers, and students indicates that Santa Clara County Office of Education's (SCCOE) has not implemented a process and criteria to determine the effectiveness of programs for English Learners, including an on-going mechanism for using the procedures above to improve program implementation and to modify the program, as needed.
	Current Status:	Resolved
4.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	VII-EL 21. LE Teaching Program of Instruction in English Language
	Finding:	A review of the SCCOE's placement policies for English learners, ELD curriculum, course descriptions, student records, daily schedules, as well as classroom observations, and interviews with teachers and administrators reveals that not all English learners at Santa Clara County Juvenile Hall are receiving an appropriate program of instruction in ELD differentiated to their proficiency level, in order to develop proficiency in English as rapidly as possible.
	Current Status:	Resolved
5.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	VII-EL 22. EL Teaching Meeting the District's Content
	Finding:	A review of grade level course description, subject matter course description, student records, evaluation reports, county and school data, as well as classroom observations and interviews with students, teachers, and administrators reveal that English learners at Santa Clara County Juvenile Hall have not met expectations for academic progress as established in the district catch-up

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

		plan.
	Current Status:	Resolved
6.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CE 09: CE Parent Notification II-PI 3
	Finding:	A review of documentation including the SCCOE Program Improvement (PI) letter for Year 3 and interviews with staff indicated that SSCOE had not sent to parents the required PI Year 1 letter for the Santa Clara Juvenile Hall School.
	Current Status:	Resolved
7.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-N or D 14: N or D Accountability
	Finding:	<p>During interviews and review of program evaluation documentation, it was determined that the SCCOE did not evaluate the Title I, Part D program and document how the evaluation results from the following items were used to improve the program:</p> <p>Completion of secondary school requirements and ability to obtain employment.</p> <p>Accrual of credits toward promotion and graduation.</p> <p>Transition to a regular program or other education program.</p> <p>Participation in postsecondary education and job training programs as appropriate.</p>
	Current Status:	Resolved

**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation—DJJ**

January 20 to 22, 2010

Sites visited: Educational Services Branch and Johanna Boss High School

This review resulted in no non-compliant findings.



California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation—DJJ**

March 23 to 24, 2010

Site visited: James A. Wieden High School

This review resulted in no non-compliant findings.

**2008–09 Federal Program Monitoring Reviews**

In February 2009, the CDE suspended all non-mandated on-site FPM reviews for approximately one year. Reviews resumed in January 2010, and two county offices of education (COEs), Humboldt and Modoc, were reviewed. County court schools within these two COEs were reviewed. The following is a listing of these reviews and all non-compliant findings identified.

**Humboldt County Office of Education**

February 2 to 5, 2010

Sites visited: COE level, Southern Humboldt Community, Humboldt COE Court,  
Humboldt COE Juvenile Hall, Hoopa Community

The Humboldt COE review resulted in four non-compliant findings as listed below. All non-compliant items have been resolved.

1.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-CP 5 Governance-SSC SPSA
	Finding:	The SSC has not developed the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) including the proposed expenditures.
	Current Status:	Resolved
2.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CP 6 Governance-SSC Membership
	Finding:	The SSC membership for the Humboldt County Court and Community Schools is not comprised as required by law.
	Current Status:	Resolved
3.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	III-CP 11 Funding-Administrative Charges
	Finding:	A Personnel Activity Report (PAR) is not being completed by a staff member being paid with multiple cost objectives including Title I, Part D funds.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

	Current Status:	Resolved
4.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	I-CE 2 Involvement-Parents
	Finding:	Humboldt COE did not convene an annual meeting to inform parents of participating students of the requirements of Title I and their rights to be involved.
	Current Status:	Resolved

**Modoc County Office of Education**

February 9 to 10, 2010

Sites visited: COE level, Modoc County Juvenile Hall/Community, Modoc County Community

The Modoc COE review resulted in 16 non-compliant findings as listed below. All non-compliant items have been resolved.

1.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CP 4 Governance-LEA Plan
	Finding:	No LEA Plan or SPSA updates have been made.
	Current Status:	Resolved
2.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CP 5 Governance-SSC SPSA
	Finding:	The LEA has not developed a SPSA.
	Current Status:	Resolved
3.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	II-CP 6 Governance-SSC Membership
	Finding:	The SSC was not duly selected by its various peers and that parity does not exist between the two sides of the membership.
	Current Status:	Resolved
4.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	II-CP 11 Funding-Administrative Charges
	Finding:	No semiannual certifications of employment.
	Current Status:	Resolved
5.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-CP 14 Accountability-SPSA Evaluation
	Finding:	The SSC revealed that the SSC has not evaluated and determined that the needs of all students have been met.
	Current Status:	Resolved

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

6.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	II-EL 4 Governance-Student Reporting
	Finding:	The required parent notification letter does not exist.
	Current Status:	Resolved
7.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	IV-EL 6 Accountability-Determines the Effectiveness
	Finding:	The SSC revealed that the LEA does not have a mechanism in place for ensuring ongoing monitoring of the EL program.
	Current Status:	Resolved
8.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	IV-EL 7 Accountability-Reclassifies Pupils
	Finding:	There is no process for reclassification.
	Current Status:	Resolved
9.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	V-EL 9 Staffing-Provides High Quality Professional Development
	Finding:	EL Professional development was not being offered.
	Current Status:	Resolved
10.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	VI-EL 10 Equal Opportunity-Parental Exception Waiver
	Finding:	The LEA has not defined its criteria for less than reasonably fluent nor has it designed an English language acquisition process designed for children learning the language.
	Current Status:	Resolved
11.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	VI-EL 11 Equal Opportunity-Informed of Placement
	Finding:	There is no notification of parental exception waiver.
	Current Status:	Resolved
12.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	VII-EL 12 Teaching-Program of Instruction in English Language
	Finding:	Each EL does not receive a program of English Language Development.
	Current Status:	Resolved
13.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	I-CE 2 Involvement-Parents
	Finding:	The LEA does not have a school-parent compact.
	Current Status:	Resolved
14.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus:	IV-CE 5 Accountability

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

	Finding:	Program evaluation containing the required elements is not being completed.
	Current Status:	Resolved
15.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	VII-CE 10 Teaching and Learning
	Finding:	Title I schools do not have an SPSA
	Current Status:	Resolved
16.	Dimension-Program Number and Focus	IV-NorD 7 Accountability
	Finding:	The LEA does not use multiple measures of student progress in evaluating the Title I, Part D program and has not used the evaluation results to make programmatic changes.
	Current Status:	Resolved

**Element 3**

**A description of the number and type of staff utilized and the scope and duration of each of CDE's monitoring reviews and site visits to county court schools and DJJ schools in the current and prior fiscal year.**

FPM reviews are led by a Regional Team Leader (RTL), who is an Education Programs Consultant (EPC), and at least one other EPC. In addition to the review of the LEA, one day is usually spent reviewing each of the sites scheduled for the review. Note: Not all staff listed conducts a site visit. Some programs conduct reviews online.

**2010–11 Federal Program Monitoring Reviews**

**Solano County Office of Education (Cycle A Online Review)**

January 19 to 21, 2011

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Administrator I</li> <li>Education Programs Consultant (3)</li> <li>RTL</li> </ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Compensatory Education 2. English Learner	1. County Office of Education 2. Solano County Community	3

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

3. Neglected or Delinquent	3. Solano Juvenile Hall	
----------------------------	-------------------------	--

**Tulare County Office of Education (Cycle A Online Review)**

March 28 to 30, 2011

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Programs Consultant (4)</li> <li>RTL</li> </ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Compensatory Education 2. English Learner 3. Neglected or Delinquent	1. County Office of Education 2. Tulare County Court	3

**San Diego County Office of Education (Cycle A Online Review)**

May 24 to 27, 2011

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Programs Consultant</li> <li>RTL</li> </ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Compensatory Education	1. County Office of Education 2. Hope Region Community 3. Metro Region	4

**Merced County Office of Education (Cycle C Online Review)**

June 27 to 30, 2011

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Programs Consultant (2)</li> <li>RTL</li> <li>Staff Services Analyst</li> </ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Compensatory Education	1. County Office of Education	

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

2. English Learner 3. Neglected or Delinquent	2. Merced County Juvenile Hall/Community	4
--	---	---

**Orange County Office of Education (Cycle C Online Review)**

July 25 to 26, 2011

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Programs Consultant (2)</li> <li>RTL</li> <li>Staff Services Analyst</li> </ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Compensatory Education 2. English Learner 3. Neglected or Delinquent	1. County Office of Education 2. Access Juvenile Hall	4

**Los Angeles County Office of Education (Cycle C Online Review)**

August 29 to September 2, 2011

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Programs Consultant (3)</li> <li>RTL</li> <li>Staff Services Analyst</li> </ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Compensatory Education 2. English Learner 3. Neglected or Delinquent	1. County Office of Education 2. Central Juvenile Hall 3. Gonzales (David) Camp 4. Kilpatrick (Vernon) Camp 5. Mendenhall (William) Camp 6. Munz (John) Camp	5

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

**2009–10 Federal Program Monitoring Reviews**

**San Bernardino County Office of Education (Cycle D On-site Review)**

May 4 to 7, 2010

<b>Number of CDE Staff</b>	<b>Type of CDE Staff</b>	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Education Programs Consultant (3)</li><li>• RTL</li></ul>	
<b>Scope of Review (programs)</b>	<b>Scope of Review (sites)</b>	<b>Duration (days) of review</b>
1. Compensatory Education 2. English Learner 3. Neglected or Delinquent	1. County Office of Education 2. San Bernardino County Juvenile Detention and Assessment Center 3. East Valley Community Day School	4

**Santa Clara County Office of Education (Cycle D On-site Review)**

May 26 to 28, 2010

<b>Number of CDE Staff</b>	<b>Type of CDE Staff</b>	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Education Programs Consultant (3)</li><li>• RTL</li></ul>	
<b>Scope of Review (programs)</b>	<b>Scope of Review (sites)</b>	<b>Duration (days) of review</b>
1. Compensatory Education 2. English Learner 3. Neglected or Delinquent	1. County Office of Education 2. Juvenile Hall 3. County Community	3

**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation—DJJ**

January 20 to 22, 2010

<b>Number of CDE Staff</b>	<b>Type of CDE Staff</b>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Education Programs Consultant (2)</li><li>• RTL</li></ul>

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Neglected or Delinquent	1. Educational Services Branch 2. Johanna Boss High School	3

**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation—DJJ**  
March 23 to 24, 2010

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Programs Consultant (2)</li> <li>RTL</li> </ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Neglected or Delinquent	1. Educational Services Branch 2. James A. Wieden High School	2

**2008–09 Federal Program Monitoring Reviews**

**Humboldt County Office of Education**  
February 2 to 5, 2010

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Programs Consultant</li> <li>RTL</li> </ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Compensatory Education 2. Neglected or Delinquent 3. Cross Programs	1. County Office of Education 2. Southern Humboldt Community 3. Humboldt COE Court 4. Humboldt COE Juvenile Hall 5. Hoopa Community	4



California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

**Modoc County Office of Education**

February 9 to 10, 2010

Number of CDE Staff	Type of CDE Staff	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Education Programs Consultant (2)</li><li>• RTL</li></ul>	
Scope of Review (programs)	Scope of Review (sites)	Duration (days) of review
1. Compensatory Education 2. English Learner 3. Neglected or Delinquent 4. Cross Programs	1. County Office of Education 2. Modoc County Juvenile Hall/Community 3. Modoc County Community	2

**Element 4**

**Identification of CDE's latest monitoring tools being utilized for the county court school and state DJJ school reviews.**

Each program instrument contains federal and state legal requirements organized into statutory core items and supporting items arranged under seven general CDE dimensions. FPM team members use Program Instruments to determine whether an LEA is meeting requirements of each item.

Program instruments are developed and reviewed by the CDE on an annual basis and may change from year to year to respond to changes in federal or state law, regulations, or court cases.

Sixteen program instruments were used during the 2010–11 school year. The CP instrument has been eliminated. However, all of the items formerly in the CP instrument are now included in the appropriate program instruments. Another key change is that there is no longer a separate Program Improvement (PI) instrument. Instead, all items formerly in the PI instrument are now included in the Compensatory Education (CE) instrument. Lastly, the use of funds under the Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) grant (Title II, Part D) will be reviewed within the context of the new Fiscal Monitoring instrument. The program instruments are available for review on the CDE 2010–11 Program Instruments Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/progins1011.asp>.

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

#### Element 5

##### **A summary of technical assistance provided through CDE to county court schools and DJJ schools for the purpose of improving educational outcomes for students and schools.**

Technical assistance is provided through telephone contacts, conference calls, presentations at conferences, meetings with LEAs and organizations supporting alternative education, trainings, and through the process of resolving findings of items not meeting legal requirements with LEAs. Additionally, technical assistance and professional development to County Court and DJJ Schools is provided through a contract executed with the Fresno County Office of Education (FCOE) on March 29, 2011.

Through this contact, the FCOE has established an English learner (EL) training team. Each county court school throughout the state has had one site visit by the team to participate in a needs assessment for training. Two areas the needs assessment has highlighted are:

1. The majority of the county court schools are using the Home Language Survey for identifying English learners.
2. The majority, 71 schools, identified wanting assistance with developing and implementing an English Language Development (ELD) program.

The FCOE is providing 40 hours of embedded professional development through Trainer-of-Trainers (TOT) Institutes to train county court and DJJ teams of teachers/educators. The TOT model incorporates a lead English learner teacher or English Language Arts teacher at each school site to participate in the FCOE training who then trains other teachers at their school. Research supports the forming of school teams as the optimal configuration for training as professional development is more effective when teachers participate with others from their school. For training, each county court and DJJ school will identify a team of three: an administrator, an instructional coach, and the EL teacher.

There will be three TOT Institutes with the first occurring March through June 2011. To increase accessibility for the schools, the training is being provided regionally based on the 11 regions of the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA). The First Institute is 12 hours, over two consecutive days, and covers statutory requirements, EL identification, assessment, instruction, parent involvement, and EL program evaluation. At the training, participants receive training

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

materials and a Universal Serial Base flash drive with the presentation and research on ELs uploaded.

For the First Institute, five trainings have taken place throughout March and April 2011 attended by 66 participants. Five more trainings will occur in June 2011 with 169 participants registered to date. A regional training was cancelled and merged with another due to low registration. The First Institute will be provided to the four DJJ schools in a separate training in June 2011.

The 12 hours of training have been digitally recorded and will be archived on FCOE's Web site and included as part of a Web-based video conferencing system, the kindergarten through grade twelve High Speed Network. Starting in June 2011, this will be a parallel online learning strand of professional development using monthly video conferences that will be implemented regionally and statewide. Copies of the 12-hour training on Digital Versatile Discs are also in the process of being sent to the 58 county offices of education and each county court and DJJ school to be used for training other teachers.

For collaboration and to promote the trainings, the FCOE has extended outreach and made presentations to the following organizations and networks:

- California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
- Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee
- Juvenile Court, Community, and Alternative School Administrators of California
- California Association of Latino Superintendents and Administrators
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, DJJ
- Bilingual Coordinators Network
- Title III County Offices of Education Regional Leads
- David Murphy, Administrator, DJJ

#### Element 6

##### **A description of interventions, corrective actions, and sanctions provided through CDE to county court schools and DJJ schools as a result of state or federal program reviews or accountability programs.**

Upon completion of each FPM review, the CDE provides the LEA with a Notification of Findings (NOF) report. In addition to listing the non-compliant findings, if any, the CDE FPM team also describes in the NOF what the LEA needs to do in order to resolve each non-compliant finding. The CDE provides technical assistance to the LEA to resolve outstanding findings and continues to work with the LEA until compliance is resolved. In

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

addition to the technical assistance noted in Element 5, specific technical assistance that the CDE provides to LEAs with non-compliant findings includes reviewing the LEAs proposed compliance agreement and all related documentation submitted, and providing specific feedback on such documentation. When warranted, the technical assistance includes working with the appropriate LEA staff on understanding the specific program requirements and the LEAs program implementation of such requirements.

In the case of longstanding non-compliance, the State Board of Education (SBE) may withhold funding for categorical programs. Each LEAs ConApp is approved by the SBE each year. The SBE may grant regular approval, conditional approval, or not approve the ConApp and possibly withhold funds. During the 2010–11 school year, the SBE granted regular approval to the majority of LEAs and granted conditional approval to a smaller number. During the period covered by this report, all COEs and the DJJ have had their ConApps approved and have not had any ConApp funds withheld.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

**Part II: State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile  
Justice Schools**

**Section 2: Special Education Monitoring**

**Element 1**

**A description of CDE's monitoring process for county court schools and state DJJ schools statewide for purposes of assuring compliance with state and federal programs and for monitoring access to services and performance outcomes for youth attending these schools.**

**General Information**

The CDE implemented a comprehensive statewide system of monitoring for special education which encompasses annual collection and analysis of district information, monitoring reviews, evaluation and planning processes, training and technical assistance, and dispute resolution systems.

There are approximately 1,050 school districts, 122 special education local plan areas (SELPA's), 58 COEs, approximately 671 charter schools, and 4 State Operated Programs (SOPs). Each of these agencies is a LEA within the meaning of California *Education Code* Section 56026.3.<sup>1</sup>

At the CDE, the Special Education Division (SED) staff is divided into five focused monitoring and technical assistance (FMTA) teams, each of which is responsible for a specific region of the state. Education Program Consultants on these teams are assigned to specified SELPA's within their team's region, and they are responsible for coordinating all monitoring and technical assistance activities in those SELPA's.

The SED monitors LEA's using a focused monitoring approach. SED's goals and state performance plan indicators (SPPIs) play a central role in selecting districts for review and shaping the content of the review. The overall goal is to achieve appropriate educational outcomes for children with disabilities. The following discussion highlights the main components of the state's monitoring system.

---

<sup>1</sup> A "local educational agency" "means a school district, a county office of education, a nonprofit charter school participating as a member of a special education local plan area, or a special education local plan area." (*Education Code* Section 56026.3.)

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

#### **Annual Collection and Analysis of District Information**

Each SELPA must submit a local plan consisting of an annual budget and service plan. Second, the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) generates indications of school district performance on SPPIs and federal and state time line compliance (e.g., annual review of individualized education programs [IEPs] and triennial reevaluations). Third, SED collects and analyzes ongoing school district complaint and due process histories to help ensure that state and federal laws and regulations are implemented. Both SED and districts utilize all the information gathered to identify concerns in order to focus the special education self-review (SESR) and verification review (VR) processes.

#### **Element 2**

**A listing of specific CDE monitoring reviews and site visits conducted—including, but not limited to, Categorical Program Monitoring, English learners, and special education reviews—for county court schools and State DJJ schools in the current and prior fiscal year and a summary of the findings and outcomes of each of those reviews.**

#### **Element 3**

**A description of the number and type of staff utilized and the scope and duration of each of CDE's monitoring reviews and site visits to county court schools and DJJ schools in the current and prior fiscal year.**

#### **2009–10 Special Education Division Verification Monitoring of County Court Schools**

For the 2009–10 data collection period, seven county court schools participated in a verification review. The following chart identifies the county court school reviewed, dates of the review, number of staff involved in the review, systemic non-compliant findings, and corrective action status.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
San Mateo	February 7–11, 2011	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> <li>• Failure to ensure student participation in statewide assessments</li> </ul>	In process of correcting systemic non-compliance.
Solano	February 22–25, 2011	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> <li>• Failure to meet timeline requirements</li> </ul>	In process of correcting systemic non-compliance.
Sonoma	February 7–11, 2011	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> </ul>	In process of correcting systemic non-compliance.
El Dorado	January 19–21, 2011	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> <li>• Failure to provide behavior intervention services</li> </ul>	In process of correcting systemic non-compliance.
Humboldt	February 8–9, 2011	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> </ul>	In process of correcting systemic non-compliance.
Placer	February 16, 2011	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> </ul>	In process of correcting systemic non-compliance.
Yuba	January 25, 2011	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older, especially course of study</li> <li>• Failure to implement the student's</li> </ul>	In process of correcting systemic non-compliance.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
			individualized education plan	

**2008–09 Special Education Division Verification Monitoring of County Court Schools**

For the 2008–09 data collection period, seven county court schools participated in a verification review. The following chart identifies the county court school reviewed, dates of the review, number of staff involved in the review, systemic non-compliant findings, and corrective action status.

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
Imperial	August 13, 2010	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to include a statement of how the student's disability affects involvement and progress in the general education curriculum in the student's IEP</li> </ul>	Closed
Lassen	February 22–23, 2010	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> <li>• Failure to have a mental health interagency agreement</li> <li>• Failure to reevaluate students</li> <li>• Failure to include districts in the development of local plan revision</li> </ul>	Closed
Butte	March 9–10, 2010	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> <li>• Failure to develop a written report enabling involvement and</li> </ul>	Closed



California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
			progress in general education	
Colusa	February 23–24, 2010	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to reevaluate students</li> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> <li>• Failure to provide written notice</li> </ul>	Closed
Mendocino	February 16–17, 2010	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to include all required IEP team members</li> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> <li>• Failure to provide written notice</li> </ul>	Closed
Fresno	March 8–12, 2010	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to include a general education teacher in IEP meetings</li> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> <li>• Failure to obtain excusal of required absent IEP team members</li> <li>• Failure to provide interim placement</li> </ul>	Closed
Ventura	February 22–26, 2010	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to arrange an IEP at a mutually agreeable time and place</li> <li>• Failure to include a general education teacher in IEP meetings</li> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for</li> </ul>	In process of correcting systemic non-compliance.

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
			students aged 16 years and older • Failure to obtain excusal of required absent IEP team members • Failure to implement the IEP Failure to provide interim placement	

**2007–08 Special Education Division Verification Monitoring of County Court Schools**

For the 2007–08 data collection period, 10 county court schools participated in a verification review. The following chart identifies the county school reviewed, dates of the review, number of staff involved in the review, systemic non-compliant findings, and corrective action status update for the findings identified in last year's report.

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
Alameda	June 9–11, 2008	6	• Failure to include all contents in assessment report • Failure to document a description of how a student's progress would be measured • Failure to provide secondary transition requirements • Failure to provide written notice of individualized education program (IEP) meeting • Failure to implement student IEP	Closed
Contra Costa	June 23–25, 2008	4	• Failure to include all contents in assessment report • Failure to follow	Closed

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>timelines when developing IEP</li> <li>• Failure to meet secondary transition requirements</li> <li>• Failure to provide written notice of IEP meeting</li> </ul>	
Kern	October 20–24, 2009	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services for students aged 16 years and older</li> </ul>	Closed
Los Angeles	December 4–7, 2007	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide prior written notice</li> <li>• Failure to follow assessment timelines</li> <li>• Failure to complete vision and hearing screening</li> <li>• Failure to complete timely reevaluations</li> <li>• Failure to implement student IEP</li> <li>• Failure to include general education teacher in IEP meetings</li> <li>• Failure to consider the language needs of students</li> <li>• Failure to provide transition services</li> <li>• Failure to provide a summary of student's academic and functional performance</li> </ul>	Closed
Orange	August 11–14, 2008	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide proper assessment of students with limited English proficiency</li> <li>• Failure to provide valid assessments</li> <li>• Failure to consider the</li> </ul>	Closed

California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office:  
Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division  
of Juvenile Justice Schools

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
			language needs of English language learners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition services</li> <li>• Failure to use the California English Language Development Test</li> <li>• Failure to provide appropriate instruction to English language learners</li> </ul>	
Riverside	June 9–13, 2008	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to provide transition from school to postsecondary services/settings</li> <li>• Failure to provide the student's IEP at the beginning of the school year</li> <li>• Failure to show a direct relationship between present level of performance, goals, and the specific educational services provided</li> </ul>	Closed
Sacramento	November 5–7, 2008; December 18, 2008	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to meet required IEP timelines</li> <li>• Failure to document student progress toward meeting goals</li> <li>• Failure to include a general education teacher in IEP meetings</li> <li>• Failure to provide transition services</li> </ul>	Closed
Santa Clara	August 5–7, 2008	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to meet assessment timelines</li> <li>• Failure to include a general education</li> </ul>	Closed

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

County Court School Monitored	Date	Number of Staff Involved	Summary of Major Non-compliant Findings	Status of Corrective Actions
			teacher in IEP meetings • Failure to implement the IEP • Failure to provide transition services • Failure to provide a summary of student's academic and functional performance	
San Diego	June 16–20, 2008	5	• Failure to transition the student from school to postsecondary services/settings	Closed
San Bernardino	October 6–10, 2008	5	• Failure to develop an assessment plan • Failure to include parent input at IEP meetings	Closed

#### Element 4

**Identification of CDE's latest monitoring tools being utilized for the county court school and state DJJ school reviews.**

#### Special Education Self-Review

Each year, approximately one-quarter of California's school districts complete a Special Education Self-Review (SESR) and report findings to the SED via customized software. Both the SESR and VRs use this software to track compliance with federal and state regulatory requirements. The SESR is a collaborative process between the SELPA and the district.

There are three major stages to the SESR process:

**Stage one:** The district team (which includes a parent representative) develops a monitoring plan that includes a complete analysis of a variety of data sources (parent

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

input, compliance history, complaint history, due process status, adequate yearly progress [AYP], and overdue annual IEP review and triennial reevaluation status) and the district's SPPI data measures that are summarized by the district to generate data reports. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the district submits its monitoring plan to SED for approval. Based upon the district's data, the SESR software identifies the specific Part B and State requirements that the district must address as part of its SESR. Very small districts (where fewer than 20 students receive special education and related services) are not required to submit a monitoring plan. These districts must complete the educational benefit review process (see below) for up to five special education students and report the findings to SED.

**Stage two:** After SED approves the monitoring plan, the district, with support from its SELPA, begins its monitoring review activities. The district must select and review a random sample of student records; the minimum number of files that a district must review depends on the number of special education students enrolled in that district. The student record review process identifies both student-specific and systemic (system-wide pattern) non-compliance. SED's monitoring procedures provide criteria for distinguishing between student-specific and systemic issues. While the corrective actions that a district must take are different for the two types of findings, districts must correct all non-compliance within one year of identification. In addition, the record reviews are used as part of the educational benefit and IEP implementation review processes.

During the educational benefit review process, student assessment and subsequent IEPs are chronologically screened according to the student's present levels of performance, goals, placements, services, and progress. These elements are analyzed to determine whether the student's program is reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.

The failure to implement the IEP is the most frequent finding of non-compliance identified through the SED complaint process. To address this concern, SED conducts an IEP implementation component to enable the district to verify if students receive all services contained in the IEP. In reviewing IEP implementation, SED reviews up to 10 student files, randomly selects 5 IEPs, and must review up to 5 files of students who are emotionally disturbed or receiving mental health services. A combination of observations and interviews with parents, service providers, and students provide evidence to determine if students' IEPs are being implemented as written.

Policy and procedure review is another component of the monitoring review activities. Policies and procedures are reviewed for procedural (process issues such as timelines) compliance and to follow up on issues and concerns identified in the Monitoring Plan.

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

The format for reviewing district policies and procedures is generated by the customized software. All findings of non-compliance in this review are considered systemic.

**Stage three:** Each district is required to complete the Local Plan Governance Review to determine if the SELPA implemented the required components of the special education local plan, including annual budget, service plan, and local interagency agreements with the county mental health agency.

Any findings of non-compliance, together with an explanation of the reason for the non-compliance, are entered into the database software system, which generates a list of corrective actions. Stage three consists of an analysis of the results of the monitoring activities, development of corrective action plans, tracking of correction, and follow-up reviews. There are two types of findings of non-compliance: student level and systemic distinguished. Areas of student level non-compliance are identified by a review of student records and through the IEP implementation process, and must be corrected within 45 days. Non-compliance regarding educational benefit is also addressed at the student level, and an IEP Team meeting is held promptly to review the educational benefit finding for the student and to consider the need for compensatory services. Systemic findings require a four-step process, and the first three must be completed within 90 days. The district must provide SED with: (1) evidence that its policies and procedures are compliant with federal and state law; (2) evidence that it has notified staff of policies and procedures; (3) evidence that it has conducted in-service training to staff and administrators; and (4) a list of all students who participated in the required revised process after six months. In addition, a six-month or one-year follow up review is conducted to ensure that based on a random sample of student records, no new instances of non-compliance have been identified. SED reported that items are cleared when there is evidence of correction and that in all cases, identified non-compliance must be corrected within one year of identification.

### Verification Reviews

Verification reviews (VRs) are conducted for 20 districts annually. SED selects districts for VRs in a variety of ways based on some of the following factors: (1) districts that demonstrate significantly sub-average performance or low SPPI values in stakeholder-selected areas (e.g., least restrictive environment, over identification of children with disabilities, and academic performance); (2) the results of complaint investigations that indicate recurrent non-compliance; (3) data from SED staff that allege violations of applicable regulations; (4) data from a history of reviews that indicate the need for further review; and (5) districts that are randomly selected for further review. VRs contain all of the components of the SESR noted above, with the addition of parent, staff, and administrator interviews. VR teams conduct interviews with parents, staff, and

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

administrators based on questions derived from the software from items included in the monitoring plan. In addition, teams are encouraged to add more questions to address specific concerns. VR teams spend approximately four to five days on-site followed by a post review meeting to review the findings and develop corrective action plans. Three reports are generated: superintendent summary, student corrective action plan, and systemic corrective action plan. SED reported that it conducts at least one follow-up on-site per VR. In all cases, identified non-compliance must be corrected within one year. The review is not closed until the district has demonstrated sustained correction in all identified areas.

SED conducts a follow-up visit to validate every systemic finding identified during a VR to ensure that the non-compliance has been corrected in a timely manner. For SESRs, SED selects a sample of five percent of the districts that have participated in the SESR and conducts an on-site visit to validate if the data are accurate and to determine whether any identified non-compliance has been corrected. SED selects the districts based on random sampling and data that may appear questionable.

#### **Facilitated District Reviews**

Facilitated district reviews (FDRs) are for school districts that have the lowest 15 percent of SPPIs and that are identified as needing program improvement. FDRs begin with the VR and proceed with site- and district-based intervention. Districts voluntarily agree to participate in a three-year process supported through a grant and support from the Riverside County Achievement Team (RCAT). Eight districts have completed the first cohort of the FDRs and there are an additional four districts participating in the second cohort.

#### **Element 5**

##### **A summary of technical assistance provided through CDE to county court schools and DJJ schools for the purpose of improving educational outcomes for students and schools.**

SED offers training and technical assistance through a variety of methods that are based on statewide and local needs, stakeholder input, and changes in statutes or regulations. SED uses a number of contracted projects and SED EPCs to provide varying levels of training, technical assistance, and resources to LEAs, parents, and professionals to ensure compliance with federal and state law and to improve student achievement and outcomes. Some of these projects include California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CALStat), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)



## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

Resources Project, Special Education Early Childhood Administrators Project (SEECAP), and Special Education Early Delivery System Project (SEEDS). SED provides training and technical assistance through on-site and follow-up visits, annual workshops, satellite conferences, webcasts, and telephone contacts. Pursuant to the 2008 Budget Act, the CDE worked with Sacramento, San Bernardino, and San Diego COEs to provide technical assistance to juvenile court schools throughout the State of California, specifically:

- Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE) developed a number of PowerPoint presentations and two webcasts that demonstrate a service delivery model based on matching interventions and instruction to student needs; frequent progress monitoring and data driven decision making. SCOE has conducted presentations to individual county staff from throughout the state.
- SBCOE developed a project manual that demonstrates best practices in sharing and accessing student records to ensure the timely implementation of IEPs. The SBCOE created a computer shell program so that other juvenile court programs may implement this model approach. Interested juvenile court programs are receiving the shell program, manual, and training.
- San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) developed multiple modules that demonstrate best practices in curriculum and instruction in juvenile court settings. The SDCOE created a pre-test and post-test that will allow the juvenile court programs to assess how the program is meeting student needs and identifying what support they need. SDCOE is training juvenile court staff throughout the state.

The Alternative Education Branch of the Juvenile Courts Community and Alternative Schools Administrators of California will hold an annual conference in May at which all three juvenile court programs will present their programs related to the agreements with CDE.

#### **Element 6**

**A description of interventions, corrective actions, and sanctions provided through CDE to county court schools and DJJ schools as a result of state or federal program reviews or accountability programs.**

## California Department of Education

### Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Analyst's Office: Identification and Status of State Monitoring of County Court Schools and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools

#### **Timely Correction of Non-compliance**

SED's monitoring processes, including both the SESR and SED's monitoring of LEAs, result in findings of non-compliance at the student and district levels, and SED requires correction of all findings within one year of identification. SED maintains documentation of: (1) the date on which it notified the district of non-compliance; (2) the follow-up procedures that SED implemented to determine whether the non-compliance was corrected; (3) the date on which SED notified the district that it had corrected the non-compliance; and (4) that the non-compliance was corrected within one year of identification.

#### **Sanctions**

SED has a variety of sanctions available to use in situations when LEAs are substantially out of compliance, fail to comply with corrective action orders, or fail to implement the decision of a due process hearing. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction may apply the following sanctions: corrective action plans or compliance agreements, special conditions, disapproval of local plans, withholding state and/or federal funds, and seeking court enforcement of corrective actions.

2009–10 County Court, County Community, and State Division of Juvenile Justice Schools with Teacher Information										
CDS Code	County	District Name	School Name	Enrollment	Teachers with Full Credential	Teachers without Full Credential	Core Classes Taught	Classes Taught by ESEA Compliant Teachers	Percent of Classes EAEA Compliant	Classes taught by non-ESEA Compliant Teachers
01100170130401	Alameda	Alameda County Office of Education	Alameda County Juvenile Hall/Court	249	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
01100170130419	Alameda	Alameda County Office of Education	Alameda County Community	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
03100330330035	Amador	Amador County Office of Education	County Community	79	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
3322760330027	Amador	CEA Amador Co	Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp	147	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
3322760337352	Amador	CEA Amador Co	James A. Wieden High	42	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
04100410430066	Butte	Butte County Office of Education	Table Mountain	40	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
05100580530048	Calaveras	Calaveras County Office of Education	Calaveras River Academy	58	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
05100589010745	Calaveras	Calaveras County Office of Education	Oakendell Community	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
06100660630111	Colusa	Colusa County Office of Education	Colusa County Community	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
06100660634774	Colusa	Colusa County Office of Education	Juvenile Hall-Nielson	60	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
07100740120444	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County Office of Education	Mt. McKinley	151	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
07100740730242	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County Office of Education	Delta Vista High	89	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
07100740730614	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County Office of Education	Golden Gate Community	162	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
08100820106625	Del Norte	Del Norte County Office of Education	Elk Creek	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
08100820106666	Del Norte	Del Norte County Office of Education	Bar-O	21	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
08100820830018	Del Norte	Del Norte County Office of Education	Paragon/Avalon Independent Study	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
08100820830042	Del Norte	Del Norte County Office of Education	McCarthy Center/Court/Community	17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
09100900106047	El Dorado	El Dorado County Office of Education	Blue Ridge	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
09100900930016	El Dorado	El Dorado County Office of Education	Golden Ridge	23	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
09100900930123	El Dorado	El Dorado County Office of Education	Charter Community School, Home Study Academy	676	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

CDS Code	County	District Name	School Name	Enrollment	Teachers with Full Credential	Teachers without Full Credential	Core Classes Taught	Classes Taught by ESEA Compliant Teachers	Percent of Classes EAEA Compliant	Classes taught by non-ESEA Compliant Teachers
09100900930131	El Dorado	El Dorado County Office of Education	Rite of Passage	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
10101081030337	Fresno	Fresno County Office of Education	Fresno County Court	285	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
10101081030899	Fresno	Fresno County Office of Education	Fresno County Community	120	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
11101161130087	Glenn	Glenn County Office of Education	Glenn County Juvenile Court	9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
11101161130103	Glenn	Glenn County Office of Education	William Finch	95	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12101240106153	Humboldt	Humboldt County Office of Education	Eel River Community	57	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12101240106161	Humboldt	Humboldt County Office of Education	Eureka Community	137	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12101240106179	Humboldt	Humboldt County Office of Education	Southern Humboldt Community	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12101240106187	Humboldt	Humboldt County Office of Education	Hoopa Community	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12101240106195	Humboldt	Humboldt County Office of Education	Humboldt County Office of Education Court	17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12101240106203	Humboldt	Humboldt County Office of Education	Humboldt County Office of Education Juvenile	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
13101321330117	Imperial	Imperial County Office of Education	Imperial County Juvenile Hall/Community	366	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
14101401430073	Inyo	Inyo County Office of Education	Jill Kinmont Boothe	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
15101571530302	Kern	Kern County Office of Education	Kern County Juvenile Court	365	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
15101571530310	Kern	Kern County Office of Education	Kern County Community	1567	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
16101651630102	Kings	Kings County Office of Education	J. C. Montgomery	67	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
16101651630193	Kings	Kings County Office of Education	Kings County Community	121	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
17101730107995	Lake	Lake County Office of Education	Clearlake Community	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
17101731730068	Lake	Lake County Office of Education	Renaissance Court	17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
17101731730167	Lake	Lake County Office of Education	Lloyd Hance Community	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18101811830058	Lassen	Lassen County Office of Education	Lassen County Juvenile Court	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18101811830140	Lassen	Lassen County Office of Education	Rocky Ridge High	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
19101991996164	Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Antelope Valley Community Day	137	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

CDS Code	County	District Name	School Name	Enrollment	Teachers with Full Credential	Teachers without Full Credential	Core Classes Taught	Classes Taught by ESEA Compliant Teachers	Percent of Classes EAEA Compliant	Classes taught by non-ESEA Compliant Teachers
19101991996172	Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Office of Education	East Los Angeles Community Day	230	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
19101991996180	Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Eastern Community Day	194	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
19101991995240	Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Los Angeles Juvenile Hall/Community	2745	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
19101991996214	Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Renaissance Community Day	126	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
19101991996222	Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Tri Community Day	254	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
19322761931096	Los Angeles	CEA Los Angeles Co	Jack B. Clarke High	156	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
20102072030054	Madera	Madera County Office of Education	Enterprise Secondary	74	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
20102072030153	Madera	Madera County Office of Education	Juvenile Hall (Endeavor/Voyager Secondary)	53	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
21102150113183	Marin	Marin County Office of Education	Marin County Juvenile Court	9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
21102152130037	Marin	Marin County Office of Education	Marin County Community	166	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
23102312330124	Mendocino	Mendocino County Office of Education	West Hills Juvenile Hall Court	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
23102312330447	Mendocino	Mendocino County Office of Education	Mendocino County Community	127	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
24102492430056	Merced	Merced County Office of Education	Merced County Juvenile Hall/Community	114	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
24102492430148	Merced	Merced County Office of Education	Valley Community	841	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
25102562530038	Modoc	Modoc County Office of Education	Modoc County Juvenile Hall/Community	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
25102562530103	Modoc	Modoc County Office of Education	Modoc County Community Alturas	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
25102566117345	Modoc	Modoc County Office of Education	Modoc County Community Tulelake	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
26102642630028	Mono	Mono County Office of Education	Jan Work Community	17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
27102722730117	Monterey	Monterey County Office of Education	Wellington M. Smith, Jr.	162	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
27102722730265	Monterey	Monterey County Office of Education	Salinas Community	395	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
28102802830073	Napa	Napa County Office of Education	Napa County Juvenile Hall/Court	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
28102802830099	Napa	Napa County Office of Education	Napa County Community	161	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
29102980113019	Nevada	Nevada County Office of Education	Nevada County Academy of Learning	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

CDS Code	County	District Name	School Name	Enrollment	Teachers with Full Credential	Teachers without Full Credential	Core Classes Taught	Classes Taught by ESEA Compliant Teachers	Percent of Classes EAEA Compliant	Classes taught by non-ESEA Compliant Teachers
29102980116681	Nevada	Nevada County Office of Education	Earle Jamieson High	25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
29102980116913	Nevada	Nevada County Office of Education	Sugarloaf Mountain, Juvenile Hall Program	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
30103063030426	Orange	Orange County Department of Education	Access Juvenile Hall	918	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
30103063030764	Orange	Orange County Department of Education	Access County Community	4832	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
31103140115675	Placer	Placer County Office of Education	PCOE K–8 Community Independent Study Home	120	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
31103143130101	Placer	Placer County Office of Education	Placer County Court Schools	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
31103143130259	Placer	Placer County Office of Education	Placer County Community Schools	152	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
32103220100057	Plumas	Plumas County Office of Education	Plumas County Community	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
33103303330123	Riverside	Riverside County Office of Education	Riverside County Juvenile Court	339	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
33103303331055	Riverside	Riverside County Office of Education	Riverside County Community	1015	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
34103480106237	Sacramento	Sacramento County Office of Education	Elinor Lincoln Hickey Jr./Sr. High	83	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
34103480106245	Sacramento	Sacramento County Office of Education	North Area Community	61	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
34103480106278	Sacramento	Sacramento County Office of Education	El Centro Jr./Sr. High	194	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
34103480106286	Sacramento	Sacramento County Office of Education	Morgan Jr./Sr. High	25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
34103480118745	Sacramento	Sacramento County Office of Education	Gerber Jr./Sr. High	78	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
35103553530045	San Benito	San Benito County Office of Education	San Benito County Juvenile Hall/Community	9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
36103630107466	San Bernardino	San Bernardino County Office of Education	Community School/Independent Alternative Edu	260	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
36103633630431	San Bernardino	San Bernardino County Office of Education	San Bernardino County Juvenile Detention	232	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710115915	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	East Region Community	300	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710115923	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	South Region Community	461	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710115931	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	Hope Region Community	82	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

CDS Code	County	District Name	School Name	Enrollment	Teachers with Full Credential	Teachers without Full Credential	Core Classes Taught	Classes Taught by ESEA Compliant Teachers	Percent of Classes EAEA Compliant	Classes taught by non-ESEA Compliant Teachers
37103710115949	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	Metro Region Community	512	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710115956	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	North Region Community	352	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710115964	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	Mountain Region Court	324	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710115972	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	Mesa Region Court	546	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710115998	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	San Pasqual Academy	112	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710116012	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	Metro Region Court	38	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710116020	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	East Region Court	70	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710116038	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	North Region Court	52	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37103710120493	San Diego	San Diego County Office of Education	Monarch Elementary Community	72	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
38103893830361	San Francisco	San Francisco County Office of Education	San Francisco County Court Woodside Learning	150	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
38103893830445	San Francisco	San Francisco County Office of Education	Civic Center Secondary	207	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
39103973930195	San Joaquin	San Joaquin County Office of Education	San Joaquin County Juvenile Hall	151	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
39103973930468	San Joaquin	San Joaquin County Office of Education	San Joaquin County Community	1028	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
393222763931250	San Joaquin	CEA San Joaquin Co	Johanna Boss High	226	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
393222763990025	San Joaquin	CEA San Joaquin Co	N.A. Chaderjian High	108	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
40104054030078	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	San Luis Obispo County Juvenile Court	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
40104054030250	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	San Luis Obispo County Community	275	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41104130113258	San Mateo	San Mateo County Office of Education	Margaret Kemp Girls Camp	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41104130113266	San Mateo	San Mateo County Office of Education	Camp Glenwood	22	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41104130113282	San Mateo	San Mateo County Office of Education	North Community	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41104130113316	San Mateo	San Mateo County Office of Education	Central Community	37	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

CDS Code	County	District Name	School Name	Enrollment	Teachers with Full Credential	Teachers without Full Credential	Core Classes Taught	Classes Taught by ESEA Compliant Teachers	Percent of Classes EAEA Compliant	Classes taught by non-ESEA Compliant Teachers
41104130113324	San Mateo	San Mateo County Office of Education	South Community	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41104130113332	San Mateo	San Mateo County Office of Education	Gateway Center	36	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41104130117143	San Mateo	San Mateo County Office of Education	Canyon Oaks Youth Center	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41104134130076	San Mateo	San Mateo County Office of Education	Hillcrest at Youth Services Center	87	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
42104210116855	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara County Office of Education	Summit High School, II	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
42104214230157	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara County Office of Education	Santa Barbara County Juvenile Court	156	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
42104214230207	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara County Office of Education	Santa Barbara County Community	271	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
43104394330254	Santa Clara	Santa Clara County Office of Education	Santa Clara County Juvenile Hall	272	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
43104394330320	Santa Clara	Santa Clara County Office of Education	County Community	287	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
44104474430146	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz County Office of Education	Santa Cruz County Court	52	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
44104474430278	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz County Office of Education	Santa Cruz County Community	695	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
45104540118976	Shasta	Shasta County Office of Education	Education Resource Center	35	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
45104540118992	Shasta	Shasta County Office of Education	Magnolia Independent Learning Center	25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
45104540119008	Shasta	Shasta County Office of Education	Shasta Independent Learning	66	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
45104544530150	Shasta	Shasta County Office of Education	Shasta County Juvenile Court	40	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
45104544530317	Shasta	Shasta County Office of Education	Oasis Community	146	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
47104704730032	Siskiyou	Siskiyou County Office of Education	J. Everett Barr Court	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
48104884830071	Solano	Solano County Office of Education	Solano Juvenile Detention Facility	37	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
48104886089668	Solano	Solano County Office of Education	Solano County Community	84	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
49104964930079	Sonoma	Sonoma County Office of Education	Sonoma County Court	113	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a



CDS Code	County	District Name	School Name	Enrollment	Teachers with Full Credential	Teachers without Full Credential	Core Classes Taught	Classes Taught by ESEA Compliant Teachers	Percent of Classes EAEA Compliant	Classes taught by non-ESEA Compliant Teachers
49104964930343	Sonoma	Sonoma County Office of Education	Sonoma County Alternative Education Programs	221	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
50105045030069	Stanislaus	Stanislaus County Office of Education	Stanislaus Community	144	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
50105045030085	Stanislaus	Stanislaus County Office of Education	John B. Allard	412	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
50105045030226	Stanislaus	Stanislaus County Office of Education	Petersen Alternative Center for Education	255	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
51105120114207	Sutter	Sutter County Office of Education	Feather River Academy	116	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
52105205230016	Tehama	Tehama County Office of Education	Tehama County Juvenile Justice Center	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
53105380107268	Trinity	Trinity County Office of Education	Trinity County Home	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
53105385330048	Trinity	Trinity County Office of Education	Trinity County Juvenile Hall	9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
54105465430061	Tulare	Tulare County Office of Education	Tulare County Court	157	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
54105465430343	Tulare	Tulare County Office of Education	Tulare County Community	162	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
55105535530118	Tuolumne	Tuolumne County Superintendent of Schools	Tuolumne County Community/ISP	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
56105615630223	Ventura	Ventura County Office of Education	Providence	118	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
56105615630397	Ventura	Ventura County Office of Education	Gateway Community	177	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
56322765637780	Ventura	CEA Ventura Co	Marry B. Perry High	355	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
57105790113787	Yolo	Yolo County Office of Education	Einstein Education Center	63	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
57105795730106	Yolo	Yolo County Office of Education	Dan Jacobs	49	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
57105795730148	Yolo	Yolo County Office of Education	Midtown Community	38	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
58105870113274	Yuba	Yuba County Office of Education	Thomas E. Mathews Community	37	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
58105875830047	Yuba	Yuba County Office of Education	Yuba County Juvenile Hall/Community	51	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			<b>Total</b>	<b>30137</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Detailed teacher data for 2009–10 is not available from California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System.										

## 2009-10 LEA Reporting Form for ESEA Title I, Part D, Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk - Demographics

California Department of Education

Consolidated Application

<b>Purpose:</b> To report the number of students served with Title I, Part D, funds during 2009-10.		<b>Agency:</b> Statewide Summary	
		<b>CD code:</b>	
<b>CDE Contacts:</b> Jeff Breshears 916-319-0946 JBreshears@cde.ca.gov Lorene Euerle 916-319-0728 LEuerle@cde.ca.gov		<input type="checkbox"/> The page is not applicable because the LEA did not participate in Title I, Part D, Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk program in 2009-10.	
Number of programs operating in a multiple purpose facility		49	
	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>
Number of Facilities/Programs	181	178	187
	<b>Students Served in At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Students Served in Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Students Served in Juvenile Detention</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Hispanic or Latino of any race	16,913	1,494	30,358
American Indian or Alaska Native, not Hispanic or Latino	535	89	737
Asian, not Hispanic or Latino	991	104	1,404
Black or African American, not Hispanic or Latino	3,479	1,345	13,268
Native Hawaiian, not Hispanic or Latino	173	21	403
White, not Hispanic or Latino	6,343	735	9,562
Multiracial, not Hispanic or Latino	223	30	567
No Response	345	101	193
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	19,589	2,185	45,876
Female	9,413	1,734	10,616
<b>Age</b>			
5-10 years old	935	626	16
11-15 years old	8,379	1,460	13,683
16-18 years old	17,971	1,650	40,856
19 years and older	1,717	183	1,937
<b>Total Unduplicated Students Served</b>	<b>29,002</b>	<b>3,919</b>	<b>56,492</b>
<b># of Long-Term Students</b>	<b>12,365</b>	<b>1,975</b>	<b>11,940</b>

## Consolidated Application

Forster



## 2009-10 Title I, Part D Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk - Academic Performance Report

California Department of Education

Consolidated Application

<b>Purpose:</b> To report the academic performance of long-term students served with Title I, Part D, funds during 2009-10.	<b>Agency:</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center;">Statewide Summary</div>							
	<b>CD code:</b> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse; width: 100px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> </tr> </table>							

<b>CDE Contacts:</b> Lorene Euerle 916-319-0728 LEuerle@cde.ca.gov Jeff Breshears 916-319-0946 JBreshears@cde.ca.gov	<input type="checkbox"/> The page is not applicable because the LEA did not participate in Title I, Part D, Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk program in 2009-10.
---	---

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Reading			Mathematics		
	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention
1. Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	6,181	963	9,335	5,322	914	6,965
2. Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	4,664	583	6,876	3,828	537	5,403
3. Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	1,492	128	1,972	1,373	124	1,644
4. No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	730	61	530	510	42	511
5. Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	927	145	785	727	158	663
6. Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	437	93	864	289	80	690
7. Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	1,078	156	2,725	929	133	1,895

*ferre*